

that the gentleman and I have talked about tonight. And the gentleman said something to me earlier that just really touched me.

□ 2230

My colleague said that what we need to do is make sure we talk about the positives. So often I think what happens is that we hear the negative stories and we do not hear the positives.

Right now probably tonight all over this country and for the next two or three weeks young people are going to be marching down aisles of auditoriums and some of them will have graduation in churches. And these young people have achieved a lot.

I look at some of the students in my district, the graduation I just attended. A young man had cancer throughout his last 3 years of high school, and he is graduating with honors. Then I think of a young lady whose mother had died of AIDS, and she took care of her brothers and sisters for 2 or 3 years and now is graduating with a very, very high average, over 92 average. I really think that, and that is why I say my colleague is absolutely right, we have to look at all the wonderful things that our children are doing.

As I have said to many audiences in my district, these are the children that come from our womb. They are the children that have our blood running through their veins. And if we do not lift up our children, who are we going to lift up, I mean if we really think about it? I think that we, as a Congress, have to continue to find innovative ways to lift our children up so that they can be the best that they can be.

Every time I see a group of children come here to the Capitol, and I saw my colleague talking to a group just in the last week or so, I look at those children and I ask myself, Where will they be 5 years from now? Where will they be 10 years from now? Will they be sitting in the Congress? Will they be teachers? Will they be lawyers? Will they be doctors? Or will they have dropped out?

And I know that we as adults have a tremendous responsibility to do everything in our power to make their lives the very best that they can be. Because when we really think about it, if it were not for adults that gave us the guidance, we would not be standing here right now. If it were not for the teachers that taught us to read and write and do arithmetic, we would not be here right now.

So I think we have to continue to say to ourselves, look, it is not enough to talk, but to go out there and do the kinds of things that my colleague and I have talked about this evening. And again, I applaud my colleague for all the wonderful things that he has done and I thank him for sharing this evening with me and sharing these ideas. Because I am going to take a lot of the ideas that my colleague just talked about now, and I have got to tell him, I might not give him the cred-

it for them when I take them, but I am going to use them. But I want to thank him for his leadership.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for his help and for being here this evening.

Let me close and say to my colleagues that this thing of education is no one has a lock on all that needs to be done. We have thousands of teachers across this country who every day go into those classrooms and fight the battle of ignorance day after day. They do it without a great deal of pay, but they deserve forever our gratitude and our thanks.

The children who will soon be following us as doctors and lawyers and teachers and preachers and, as I told a group that graduated the other night, if they slip up, they might become politicians and become congressmen and governors, but the truth is they are great youngsters and we have an obligation to be better role models. We really do.

Because most of them, most of them, are great youngsters. We hear about those problems. And I think we have an obligation to make sure that we honor those who do well and encourage those who want to do better and challenge those that slip up. And I think if we will do that, they will do better, we will be prouder of them. And that means that we have an obligation here to make sure that we shepherd the resources we have, that we do fund the education budget to the extent that we can and stretch it a little bit when we have to. Because there are a lot of places in this country where, as my colleague has pointed out, there are not enough computers. We can help.

The school buildings are not as safe as they ought to be, 50- and 60-year-old buildings that are not air-conditioned, that are not wired well. We can do better. In our Nation, in having the boom time we are having today, if we cannot fix them today and provide those resources for a good environment for children to learn, if we tell a child school is important and then he rides by a \$40- or \$50-million prison to go to a \$3-million school, he has already figured out what is important in that community.

We can do something about that. We can make that school an attractive, inviting place to go if it is well-lighted. And lighting is important if we are talking about learning.

So let me thank my colleague for joining me this evening in this special order.

DRUG CRISIS IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANCREDI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, again tonight I come to the floor to discuss this serious situation in our Nation relating to the problem of illegal narcotics.

I was pleased in January to assume responsibility to chair the House Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources, which deals with formulating our national drug policy.

I know that on the front pages of tomorrow's newspapers the stories of China sabotage and I know that illegally obtained intelligence, the fundraising scandals, money that poured into our country through illegal foreign contributions, sabotage of our intelligence, information relating to missile technology are serious problems and will be splashed across the headlines tomorrow.

I know what the headlines have been for the past several weeks since Columbine and Atlanta that the Nation's attention, the Congress' attention, has been riveted on the question of school violence. And we all are saddened by these great tragedies.

But let me say tonight, and I have said it before, that for every instance of school violence, if we took all the instances of school violence and death in Paducah, Kentucky; Jonesboro, Arkansas; and Columbine and we added up all of those tragic deaths the last several years, we would still have a small figure of 30 or 40 individuals maybe maximum; and, unfortunately, I hate to use this analogy, but unfortunately, we have a Columbine times three or four every single day in the United States as a result of the use of illegal narcotics.

The effects of illegal narcotics on our society are dramatic and costly. They are indeed costly to over 1.8 million Americans, almost 2 million Americans who are behind bars. Estimates are that some 60 to 70 percent of those incarcerated in our prisons and jails and penitentiaries are there because of a drug-related offense.

I might say they are not there for casual use of drugs. They are there because they have committed a crime while under the influence of illegal narcotics, they are there because they have committed a felony, robbery, they have been trafficking and selling illegal narcotics. And they are the victims of illegal narcotics. But we have nearly 2 million Americans behind bars.

The cost that this Congress will be considering in a few more weeks to fund the anti-narcotics effort is probably in the range of \$18 billion. That is the direct cost that we will look at funding because of, again, the problems created by illegal drugs.

That is only the tip of the iceberg. We spend somewhere in the neighborhood of a quarter of a trillion dollars a year in the tremendous cost of social, economic, welfare support, judicial systems, incarceration, all these costs to our society because of the illegal narcotics problem.

Again, the tragedy is just immense. And again, we have the equivalent of a Columbine times three or four every single day. The sad part about all this is that many of these tragic deaths are

our young people. The sad part about this is that last year over 14,000 Americans lost their lives to drug-related deaths.

The tragedy is that, in the past 6 years, under the Clinton administration, going on 7, we in fact have lost almost a 100,000 people. That is the number of Americans killed in some of our wars and conflicts. That is the size of entire populations of cities. It is an incredible tragedy.

And somehow tomorrow in the newspapers it will not be publicized along with the China sabotage or the Columbine problem. But what will be publicized is back in the obituaries or on the local page or the State page is a list of human tragedies. And those tragedies will be recounted in heroin overdose deaths. They will be recounted if someone would have died at the hands of someone under the influence of narcotics, someone who is committing a felony, another murder, under the influence of illegal drugs. Those are the sad statistics of this tragedy that we are facing as a Nation.

I come again tonight to talk about this, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is the most important and critical social problem facing our Nation, long ignored, not talked about.

As chair of that subcommittee, human resources is one of our topics, in addition to criminal justice and drug policy. We conducted a hearing this past week of over 6 hours, hearing from various school officials and law enforcement officials, some district attorneys, and other people involved with schools, psychiatrists, psychologists. And they repeatedly told our panel that, in fact, illegal narcotics and drug use are at the root of most of our school violence problems.

Of course, we only see splashed across the front pages of our newspapers and on our television nightly screens one incident with a large number of casualties at one time. This is a slow and tragic death, again, thousands of them across the Nation, and an effect on our young people that is dramatic. Most of the victims of this tragedy are prime youth and are young people.

Let me also talk tonight about the history of the problem. And I try not to be partisan in nature, but I do want to be factual and state that part of the reason that we have this epidemic particularly of hard narcotics, heroin, cocaine, methamphetamines, in the United States and other dramatic increases in usage of illegal drugs is really the result of the policy of the Clinton administration.

If we look at the charts, and I have said this before, back in the 1980s we had an explosion of cocaine back in the Reagan administration. But we saw that the policies of President Reagan brought the statistics down, the usage down, of illegal narcotics and the deaths down from hard drugs.

□ 2245

That continued into the Bush administration, with tough policies, tough

eradication at the source, tough interdiction, use of the military, the Coast Guard, every possible resource of the United States to bring down illegal narcotics trafficking and the supply of hard drugs into this country.

Unfortunately the new President in 1993 as one of his first policies adopted cuts in the Drug Czar's office, began the elimination of many of the personnel in the Drug Czar's office, and then adopted a policy which I think we are still seeing the results of today. That is cuts in the interdiction forces; that is, trying to stop drugs at their source. Cuts and elimination of the source country eradication programs; that is, stopping the growth and production of illegal narcotics at their source. Again the two most cost-effective ways of stopping illegal narcotics. And then we saw the cuts of the military, dramatic cuts of use of the United States military in the interdiction of drugs, a Federal responsibility of stopping the flow of illegal drugs before they came to the borders of the United States. And then we also saw dramatic cuts, almost 50 percent cut in some of the Coast Guard budgets that protected some of our areas and coastal regions, particularly around Puerto Rico, where we had a good barrier to stop illegal narcotics coming into the United States through Puerto Rico.

Then, to top off these cuts, the President appointed a Surgeon General and that Surgeon General sent a mixed message. Joycelyn Elders did probably as much damage as any public official in the history of the United States as far as bad health policy. She sent a mixed message that even our young people repeat today, of "Just say maybe" to casual drug use.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICA. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. As a Member of the Republican task force who served with the gentleman last year, I want to first say I commend his leadership on this because not only is he down here night after night speaking about the need for Congress to act quickly but he is doing that in committee and he is a consistent national leader on this. I am here also because I am a father of a 16-year-old, a 14-year-old and a 10 and an 8-year-old and much to my shock these children are already able to get drugs at their school, as almost all kids across America are able to get it in the school yard. The fact that he is saying, "Let's attack the source of these drugs, let's enforce the law when you are caught with it, and let's work with treatment," I think that is very important. I too as a parent when the President's appointee said the statement, you know, "Let's legalize marijuana," I was shocked and very concerned about that.

Mr. MICA. Our President sets the tone. I think that as a role model, as an individual who young people look up to, when you have the President ap-

point a Surgeon General that sends a mixed message, our young people pick that up. When you have a President that has said, "If I had it to do over again, I would inhale," our young people pick that up.

Now, the gentleman told me that he had teenagers. Could he tell me the ages of them again?

Mr. KINGSTON. Sixteen, 14, and one 10 turning 11.

Mr. MICA. The gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Speaker, might be interested in this National Household Survey on Drug Abuse, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration report dated August 21, 1998. I did not know the gentleman from Georgia was coming tonight to mention the ages of at least two of his children, but this is the report. For kids 12 to 17, first-time heroin use surged a whopping 875 percent from 1992 to 1996. That is an 875 percent increase in heroin use among our teenagers. So I believe that a policy has consequences, and the consequences of a bad policy of sending a mixed message and also of not having a policy in place that stops drugs at their source in a cost-effective manner results in an increased supply, a lowering of price, a tremendous availability of illegal narcotics at these sources and into the United States.

In my central Florida area, a banner headline in the Orlando Sentinel shouted out recently that in fact drug deaths exceeded homicides in central Florida. So this is the type of result we are seeing from a policy that was enacted some 6 years ago and again through repeated failures of this administration.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield further, I want to make sure that in a nutshell what he is saying, as the usage has actually gone up, the number of arrests and enforcement has gone down?

Mr. MICA. The number of arrests, I believe, have gone up. The enforcement prosecution did go down with this administration. Now, we have hammered them some and there has been more prosecution. However, those statistics are dramatically impacted by New York City and several other tough Republican mayors. The statistics in New York City are so dramatic where you have had tough enforcement by Mayor Giuliani. For example, they had approximately 2,000 murders, 1,980 we will say, in the year he took office. Tough enforcement has resulted in a 70 percent drop, somewhere in the range of 600 murders in the entire population of New York City. So that type of tough enforcement, tough prosecution has actually skewed some of the national figures.

But if we look at the Department of Justice under this administration, they failed to go after drug dealers and hard core drug offenders in the numbers that they should have.

I also wanted to point out to my colleagues that according to the Drug Abuse Warning Network, which is called DAWN, the annual number of

heroin-related emergency room admissions and incidents increased from 42,000 in 1989 to 76,000 in 1995, an 80 percent increase. This is from the National Narcotics Intelligence Consumer Committee report in November of 1998. The number of Americans who used heroin in the past month has increased steadily since 1992. The number of Americans who used heroin in the past month increased from 68,000 in 1993, the year this President took office, that was 68,000, to 325,000 in 1997. This is also according to the National Household Survey on Drug Abuse. This is the most recent data we have from 1997. Heroin users are becoming younger, they are becoming more diverse. And because the heroin that we are seeing come into the United States today has much higher purity levels, we are seeing dramatic increases in deaths, particularly among first-time users, particularly among young people who mix heroin with some other substance, alcohol, other drugs and do not know that the purity levels are absolutely deadly. So that is why we are seeing so many young people dropping like flies in Florida and in other areas of the United States.

Mr. KINGSTON. Where does the heroin primarily come from? Is this also Colombia?

Mr. MICA. I am glad the gentleman asked.

Mr. KINGSTON. The gentleman just happens to have a chart.

Mr. MICA. I brought back tonight one of my charts to show the flow of illegal narcotics. This is a pretty simple pattern. Before the President took office in 1993, Colombia was really more of a transit country and drug processing country. Now, since we have had such good results with President Fujimori of Peru who has also had a tough enforcement program and President Hugo Banzer in Bolivia, the production of cocaine and coca is down dramatically in those countries. In the past 2 years, the Republican majority has helped those two countries in stopping drugs at the source, cutting drug production through eradication policies and alternative crop policies.

Now, would you not know it, but in 1993, again there was almost no coca produced in Colombia. It was almost all produced in Bolivia and Peru. But this administration through its policy managed to make Colombia the largest producer of cocaine in the world. In 1993, there was almost no heroin produced in Colombia. Most of our heroin came in from Asia or through Afghanistan and Balkan routes. This administration managed through its policy of stopping aid and assistance to Colombia to make Colombia the source of 75 percent of the heroin. It is the largest heroin producer in the world today. They managed to do all this since 1993. The way this heroin and cocaine is now coming up, the Colombians have formed cartels with the Mexicans, and then some is coming up through and past Puerto Rico and into the United

States through these routes. So the very direct policy, despite letters, despite pleas by the chairman of our Committee on International Relations, by the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform, by numerous Members of Congress to get helicopters, to get ammunition, to get assistance and resources to Colombia to stop this production and trafficking, Colombia now is the major producing area.

I will say that with some of those individuals I mentioned, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), we participated in a dedication and contract signing of six helicopters which are on their way to Colombia, these are Black Hawk helicopters, to start in an eradication program.

Now, our other problem area, and this is Mexico, and despite this administration giving NAFTA approval, underwriting the finances of Mexico, Mexico is the largest source of illegal narcotics coming into the United States through these routes. Again, despite being a good ally, a good friend, Mexico has turned almost into a narcoterrorist state as a result of the amount of trafficking.

So this is the pattern of illegal narcotics. Heroin, cocaine and methamphetamine coming into the United States today. What is disturbing about this pattern is that in spite of all of the assistance this Congress and this administration has given to Mexico, Mexico has really slapped the United States in the face.

When both of my colleagues who are on the floor were with me 2 years ago in March, the House of Representatives passed a resolution asking Mexico to help in about five different areas. First of all, we asked Mexico to extradite a major drug trafficker or major drug traffickers, assist us in extraditing those who have been indicted in the United States, Mexican nationals, and send them to the United States. And what did we get in return? This past week, the New York Times, "Setback for Mexico in 2 Big Drug Cases." Major producer, again we have helped Mexico, we are a good friend and ally of Mexico. What did they do? Let me read this:

"Mexico City, May 19. Efforts to prosecute the Amezcua Contreras brothers whom the American authorities say rank among the world's largest producers of illegal methamphetamines appear to be collapsing."

They have in fact let these brothers who were part of this methamphetamine operation off the hook, dropped the charges against them. Two of them, I understand, are still held in detention. One has been set free. Even the Mexicans, who are corrupt from the bottom to the very top, and I can prove what I am saying with those remarks, are chagrined that even their judicial system has collapsed, even their judicial system is corrupt, and these decisions go as high as their Supreme Court in Mexico.

□ 2300

So, it is a very sad day when we have not one major Mexican drug dealer extradited to date. We have had one Mexican national, and that is only one, and that was a minor player, but not one major Mexican drug dealer has been extradited to the United States, and again, this is in spite of the assistance that this Congress has given that country, in spite of financial aid, NAFTA trade and other benefits that we have bestowed on Mexico.

And part of it is because of the failed policy of this administration. They made a charade out of the certification process, rather than decertifying Mexico and giving them a national interest waiver and holding them under the microscope of our law which says that we must certify whether a country is fully cooperating.

Now I ask you: Is Mexico fully cooperating when they let drug traffickers out? Is Mexico fully cooperating when last year these statistics were provided us?

Mexican drug seizures were down in 1998. Opium was down, the seizure of opium in Mexico, 56 percent. The seizure of cocaine was down in Mexico by 35 percent. The seizure of vehicles and vessels involved in narcotic trafficking was down.

To top it off, we held a hearing in our subcommittee to find out what was going on in Mexico, and I talked about corruption. This is a March 16 article from the New York Times. This should absolutely frighten every Member of Congress, every member and parliamentarian in any civilized legislative body, to know that one country could be so corrupt from the bottom to the top, and particularly one that is a close ally of the United States.

This article by Tim Golden details how our Customs agents penetrated Mexican military and other Mexican high officials' offices and discovered that the Mexicans, in this case a general and maybe as high as the Minister of Defense, were attempting to launder \$1.15 billion. That is one individual was trying to launder \$1.15 billion. That is how high the corruption has grown in this country, and that is how serious this problem is. And think about that. That is over a billion dollars that one individual was trying to launder in that country.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield, what is the benefit to a country being certified, and why do we decertify it, and why has it become so political, because it does appear by the bipartisan findings of the gentleman's committee that Mexico is not cooperating in giving us the statistics that we need to fight drugs, but it seems to get politicized once the issue gets to the floor of the House.

Mr. MICA. Well, only in this administration has it so politicized. The law is a simple law. The law was passed in 1986. President Reagan and the Republican Senate passed the law that just tied foreign aid and foreign assistance

to cooperation in eradicating drugs and trafficking, stopping trafficking in their drugs.

So the law is simple. It says that if a country is cooperating with the United States to stop illegal narcotics, then they get our finance benefits, they get our trade benefits, they get our foreign aid.

Now Mexico does not get a lot in the way of foreign aid, as some Third World countries may get from the United States, but what it gets is tremendous trade benefits, a trade benefit and now we have an incredible imbalance, that many more cheap Mexican goods are pouring into the United States. We have lost tens of thousands of jobs to Mexico.

We have provided most of the financing and underwriting for Mexico, including a bailout which basically saved their financial system. So in turn we ask for very little. We have asked for cooperation in going after these corrupt officials, we have asked for extradition.

This is what Tom Constantine, our DEA administrator, said on February 24, 1999. He said: In spite of existing United States warrants, government of Mexico indictments and actionable investigative leads provided to Mexico by U.S. enforcement, limited enforcement action has taken place within the last year.

This is Tom Constantine, and I might say that one of the saddest bits of news that I bring to the floor tonight is that Tom Constantine, who has been a shining light in this scandal-ridden administration, who has been a tough spokesperson in restarting the War on Drugs, there was no War on Drugs under this administration except for what Tom Constantine has done, Tom Constantine has unfortunately announced that he will be leaving this summer, a tremendous blow to our efforts. He is the only one who has been speaking out, the only one who has repeatedly said that we have to restore the eradication programs, the interdiction programs, the use of the military, the Coast Guard, and that tough law enforcement does work, and he has proved it time and time again before our committee with statistics, with facts. So, it is a great loss to the Congress, it is a great loss to the American people, it is a tremendous loss to the war on drugs which we have restarted under this Republican Congress, and his departure is a sad note for us this evening.

I wanted to also talk tonight a little bit about some of the other things that Mexico was requested to do and has not done.

First, I mentioned extradition. Then I mentioned going after these corrupt officials in enforcing their laws, and they did not enforce their laws.

Even worse is we had an operation, another Customs operation in Mexico dealing with money laundering, and we found in this operation, which was called Operation Casablanca, that hun-

dreds of millions of dollars were being money laundered, and when we discovered this, we informed the Mexicans. We know the Mexicans knew about this operation.

What did the Mexicans do rather than cooperate with the United States? They threatened to indict and go after our Customs officials. So, did we have cooperation? The answer has to be no based on, again, the extradition requests, based on the failure to go after these corrupt officials, based on their coming after our agents and threatening them.

So these are several areas, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my friend from Florida, and representing a border State, as I do in Arizona, I share my colleague's concern, Mr. Speaker, because as my friend from Florida has capably laid out for us this evening, the time has come for a reasonable, sober reassessment of our relationship with our ally, Mexico. That is something I do not say lightly, given the fact that the history of Arizona, indeed the history of this Congress of the United States has been one of cooperation with our neighbor to the south.

But part of being a good neighbor entails a reasonable interchange and expression and ability to achieve common goals. As my friend has pointed out, sadly Mexico has devolved into a leading distributor and source of illegal drugs in our society, and because of that we must have this reassessment.

It is especially vexing to a State like Arizona with a vast border area, with many problems that entail this situation in terms of border security, and let us not forget that it is our constitutional charge to protect the borders of the United States.

□ 2310

As compelling as the facts and figures are, I think both my friends from Florida and Georgia, Mr. Speaker, and indeed everyone in the House, knows there is a very real human equation at work that these threats come to Americans, and while this is not warfare in the traditional sense, still, it is an assault and an attack on the very fiber of our society. We talk about increasing drug usage. We talk about a cavalier attitude expressed, sadly, by this President in an appearance on MTV when asked by one of the young people in the audience, if you had it to do all over again, would you inhale, and the President said, yes, I would. To use that cavalier notion toward drug usage sets a pattern that is very difficult to break.

Now our friend tells us of the soon-to-be expected departure of Mr. Constantine from his role and indeed, one who has observed this administration and tried to work on common goals, those of us in the Congress cannot help but note that it is incredibly ironic that many of the capable, effective people in a variety of different posts leave, and those who should bear the

responsibility for a number of misadventures and maladroitness insist on staying on the job in a variety of different areas.

Indeed, I think we are not far afield at all when we point out that this is a threat to our families, to our citizenry; indeed, this is a threat to our national security. As much as we want to be a good neighbor, and I have participated in the U.S.-Mexico Interparliamentary Conference in the past, the State of Arizona has a very strong relationship with the Mexican State of Sonora first established by a former Governor of Arizona much earlier, now almost 30, maybe in excess of 30 years ago when we look at the panorama and the march of time, and yet the words of my colleague from Florida are compelling, because they insist that this House and this government reassess the relationship with Mexico, reassess our relationship with these States that export narcoterrorism, and that is something we do not say lightly. Because, as my colleague has pointed out, in the past Mexico has been a strong ally of the United States. As my colleagues have also pointed out, Mr. Speaker, the United States has been a good friend to Mexico.

I can recall in the first days when I arrived when the now departing Treasury Secretary, Robert Rubin, came to new Members of the 104th Congress, asked us to step up to the plate and essentially bail out the Mexican economy, prop up the currency there, and of course the President found almost what could be called an executive end run to provide those loan guarantees because they knew it would be very rough going in the Congress of the United States.

So I share my friend's concern. I salute his determination and his dedication to bringing this issue to light, and more than just bringing the issue to light, Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Florida, in his committee jurisdiction, has also worked, as we did in the 105th Congress on the Drug Task Force, to find credible solutions. For that, I salute him, and from a border State like Arizona, and indeed across the whole phalanx of the Southwestern border of the United States, this becomes a major concern.

Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker. Just as we see threats from around the world, threats as relevant as tomorrow's headlines in view of bipartisan work in other areas, so too do we confront a threat to our families, to our children and, sadly, directly in our hemisphere, and it is a threat that has gone unabated. It is a threat that has increased, and this House is compelled, I think, by the work of our colleague from Florida, to take a closer look to deal with the security of our homes, the security of our families; indeed, our national security in this very important area of rising drug abuse and a cavalier attitude that has been expressed.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for his leadership and coming out tonight to talk about this topic that is so important to American society.

I just want to continue along the line that I had been talking about, and that is the problems with Mexico. We have not had one major drug dealer extradited. Despite over 200 requests for extradition and requests specifically for over 40 major drug dealers, not one Mexican national has been extradited today as far as a major drug dealer.

In addition to that, we talked about the enforcement, lack of enforcement, the corruption at the highest level, not enforcing the laws that they have on the books. In addition, this Congress asked two years ago that the Mexicans install radar to the south. It is a simple request. If we look at where the drugs are coming in, they are coming in from the south. We asked that they install radar to the south, and still no radar to the south that was promised, and again when our President met with President Zedillo in the Yucatan Peninsula earlier this year. To date, still no maritime agreement signed; there is no agreement to go after drug traffickers in these waters, particularly Mexican nationals.

Finally, we had asked for protection of our drug DEA agents, our drug enforcement agents. We have a small number in that country. We had one of our agents just horribly tortured and murdered in the 1980s. We do not want to see that repeated. We want our agents to be able to defend themselves, and still we have been denied that ability for our law enforcement agents that are working in Mexico.

So Mexico, what do we get? This administration ruined the certification process, made a joke of it and still continues to certify a country as fully cooperating. They are not by any measure.

I might say tonight that we will have before this House in the not-too-distant future several measures that will deal with this that the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman of the Committee on International Relations; the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform; the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), our chairman of the Select Committee on Intelligence; and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), our chairman of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice of the Committee on the Judiciary, have been working on with the Members of Congress. So there still will be responsibility to the country of Mexico for their involvement in illegal narcotics. This new Congress will hold their feet to the fire.

I just want to talk again about another failed policy, international policy, and it is our responsibility to deal with these issues of where the drugs are coming from. It is tougher as these drugs get to the streets, but if we can stop them at their source, their

transiting before they get here, it is much more cost-effective.

One of the stories we will not read on the front page of the paper tomorrow is about the bungled negotiations of this administration in Panama. Now, why is Panama important? Again, I can hold this up and if we look and see Colombia through Panama up to Mexico, that is where these narcotics transit. But Panama has been the center of all of our narcotics operations, all forward surveillance operations for the United States and the Caribbean area, the south and Central America. Of course we see where drugs are coming from, which is primarily from Colombia, one of the major sources that this administration has helped make a major source. And as of May 1, 1999, just a few weeks ago, we were basically kicked out of Panama. We had 15,000 flights from Panama last year, and there were zero as of May 1. This administration bungled the negotiations, and we were told months and months ago that negotiations were going forward. When we found out earlier this year that the State Department had dropped the ball, we asked what was going to be done. The administration has scurried the last few months and signed interim agreements with Curacao, Aruba, the Netherlands and also with Ecuador for temporary bases there.

We were told that on May 1 we would be ready to go. We were told on May 1 we would have flights continuing.

□ 2320

We were told that, at the very worst, maybe we would have a 50 percent reduction in flights after May 1 in testimony before our subcommittee. What have we found out that has taken place? From Ecuador, there are zero. There have been zero flights from Ecuador, zero flights. From Aruba and Curacao, just a few limited flights.

So basically this administration bungled the negotiations with Panama. We are turning over 5,600 buildings, \$10 billion in assets. Already we have seen, in addition to closing down Howard Air Force Base, another scandal that should be on the front pages of the newspaper, that our two ports in Panama that we had operated out of had been given through corrupt vendors, and these are the words of our administration officials, through corrupt vendors to foreign countries; and one of them happens to be the Chinese.

In both instances, I believe the Chinese Liberation army owns or has a controlling interest in the stock and ownership of those activities. So we basically turned over the Panama Canal and one of the ports to the Red Chinese Army. The other one, again also through a corrupt vendor and through a Taiwan-Hong Kong front, that second port is gone.

Our major drug operation in that entire region we have been kicked out of as of May 1. The interim agreements are not signed. I believe the agreement in Ecuador is only for a few months. At

the last hearing our subcommittee held, we were presented a bill for another \$40 plus million for improvements in addition to \$73 million which the Drug Czar put in the budget for relocating the forward surveillance operations of the United States.

So basically we are wide open for the hard drugs to come into this United States. Panama is a wide open area. Again we have lost our shirt and basically been kicked out. The \$73 million originally requested plus the supplemental, \$43 million, which has not been given yet, is only the tip of the iceberg. I am told we may be at a half a billion dollars to replace these operating facilities. We do not have a single permanent agreement in place.

I do not know how an administration can possibly bungle anything in a more inept manner than they have done with this Panama situation and basically closing down all of our forward drug surveillance operations.

These surveillance operations affect the operations, for example, in Peru, where we have gotten the cooperation of the Peruvian government to go in and eradicate narcotics fields, coca fields. Basically, that information stops because we do not have the operation going forward to identify those locations.

So these are some of the incredible problems that I wanted to detail tonight, both with the Mexico, with Colombia failed policy, stopping again the equipment from getting into Colombia.

I do not want to leave on a note that we are only here to criticize the administration. I must say that I am very proud of this new majority and what they have done. First of all, under the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) who is now the Speaker of the House of Representatives, he came in several years ago and chaired the Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs and Criminal Justice on which I serve. In that capacity, he helped put together the war on drugs.

We have to remember, from the day this President got elected, they dismantled the war on drugs. I have heard people say we do not have a war on drugs. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have not had a war on drugs. It was dismantled in January of 1993 by this President.

From 1993, this President dismantled the war on drugs. The Congress, which was controlled by the Democrats in the House and the other body, by wide margins, dismantled systematically all of the programs that the Reagan and the Bush administration had put into placement and years and years of work.

Some of that was bipartisan. The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and other Members on both sides of the aisle put together effective drug strategy. That was dismantled. There was no war on illegal drugs from 1993 to 1995.

In 1996, the Republicans, who gained control, did damage assessment and

started restoring some of the funds for eradication programs for interdiction, restoring the military in this effort, and for also putting back the Coast Guard on watch and active in this antinarcotics effort. So that is some of what we have done.

We have, through the leadership of those that I have mentioned, again, including the current Speaker of the House, put back last year almost \$1 billion in additional funding to support these efforts.

In addition to the programs that I have talked about, enforcement, interdiction, eradication, we also put \$195 million in education, which is the first time that anything has been done on that scale, to start educating our young people.

If it has to be a paid message, if it is not a high message setting a role model from the office of the President of the United States, then we will pay for it. That \$195 million is matched by donations, at least equal to that sum.

So hopefully we will, again, in restarting all of these efforts, and particularly in education, we can get out the message. The First Lady under President Reagan, Mrs. Reagan, had a simple message: "Just say no." It was repeated over and over and effective, and our young people heard that message.

But there has been a gap in this administration. No word, a mixed message, a mixed signal, no role model for young people to look up to. We have seen the results, and I described them here tonight. There is an 875 percent increase in heroin usage by our teenagers 12 to 17, dramatic figures that should shock every American and every Member of Congress.

So we have, again, put these programs back together that work. We are overseeing those programs. We will see if they are cost effective, if they are working, and will continue to expand them.

In the next few weeks when we return, we will be conducting a hearing on the question of legalization and decriminalization. I know the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) and his State has taken action on this issue. We do not know if they are headed in the right direction or the wrong direction. We do know that tough enforcement works.

The Guiliani in New York City methadone works. It cuts crime. It cuts murders. It cuts drug deaths. It cuts violence in our streets when one of our largest cities is one of our safest cities.

We see the alternative. Baltimore, which Tom Constantine, our DEA director, who is leaving, pointed out to us just a few years ago, Baltimore had 900,000 people and less than 1,000 heroin addicts. Through a liberal policy and a permissive policy Baltimore now has a population of 600,000. It has dropped 300,000 people. It has 39,000 heroin addicts.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), who is my former ranking

member on the Subcommittee on Civil Service and on this subcommittee has told me privately that the estimate is probably in excess of 50,000 heroin addicts in Baltimore.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, is it not true that Baltimore also had a very aggressive, privately funded by very liberal philanthropists, a needle exchange program where addicts could have quick and easily available access to free needles? That was one of the misguided policies that led to such a dramatic increase in the number of addicts.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, it is true that Baltimore has had one of the most liberal policies and has now been devastated. When any city in this Nation has 39,000 heroin addicts, we have a major, major problem.

□ 2330

And the crime, the social disruption, the human tragedy that that has caused in a liberal policy is very serious.

So I intend, as chair of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources of the Committee on Government Reform to conduct hearings beginning in June, when we return, on this question. We will examine what is going on in Baltimore, what is going on in New York, in other countries.

And we hope to also look at Arizona, which has had a decriminalization program that they have touted. And we will see whether that is successful and whether it is something we should look at as a model; whether it is something that should have the support of this Congress or whether they are headed in the wrong direction and we should not support those efforts.

So I am pleased tonight to come and provide the House, Mr. Speaker, with an update on some of our activities in our subcommittee, some of my efforts to try to bring to light what I consider is the biggest social problem facing this Nation, I know in my lifetime, I know in a generation, and that is the problem of illegal narcotics.

Again, over 14,000 Americans lost their lives last year. Over 100,000 have died from illegal narcotics since this President took office.

It is a human tragedy that extends far beyond Columbine or Jonesboro or any of the other tragedies we have seen in this Nation. And as I said, it is repeated day after day in community after community, and we can read it in the obituaries.

I am not here just to complain about the cost to the Federal Government. I am here to complain about the loss in productive lives. Even in this city, which is our Nation's Capital, of which we should all be proud, each year that I have come here in the last 10 years they have lost between 400 and 500 young people, mostly black African-American males who have been slaughtered on the streets, most in tragedies, some by guns, some by knives, some by

other violent death, but almost all related to illegal narcotics trafficking.

And that is the root of some of the problems in the streets of Washington, D.C., and across our country, when we have 60 to 70 percent of those behind bars there because of felonies committed under the influence of illegal narcotics or trafficking in illegal narcotics or committing felonies under the influence of illegal narcotics.

So we have a serious social problem. It is ignored by this administration, it has been ignored by this President, but it is not going to be ignored by this new majority. And if I only serve the remainder of this term in Congress, every week I will be here talking about this problem and its effects on the American people and what we intend to do as far as positive programs to resolve that. And we will do that. We will succeed.

I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my friend from Florida again for his leadership and for bringing this problem to the floor.

And again I would say that this is a question of security, personal security and the security of our families and our communities. Because, as my colleague pointed out very graphically and very tragically, the cost in human lives, with the incredible violence that accompanies illicit drug distribution and use, is ultimately a question of our national security and the security of our borders.

And, indeed, on the geopolitical stage, the consequence of those who would or who have traditionally been our friends is now sadly changing, if not to foes, then certainly not aiding us in the traditional sense as allies have in the past. And again, from the State of Arizona, from my constituents in the Sixth District, and indeed all across America, because this is a problem that transcends our borders, that transcends State lines, that sadly goes virtually into every community in the United States, it is a question we must address.

This is one of many vexing questions that now have come into our purview and that have gained the prominence and attention necessary, and again the gentleman is to be saluted for offering a clarion call to this House, to this government and, more importantly, to our people in terms of the tough choices that loom ahead for this House and for this Nation.

Mr. MICA. I thank the gentleman and yield finally to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me again say to the gentleman from Florida that we appreciate everything he is doing, the diligence that he is showing in taking this on. I wish him the best and thank him. And I want him to know that he has the support of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) and myself, and we will be following up with the gentleman and working with him.

Mr. MICA. I thank the gentleman.

CHINESE ESPIONAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANCREDI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) is recognized until midnight.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), and also invite the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) to join us. He is welcome to do so.

Mr. Speaker, the biggest and the scariest espionage in the history of our country has taken place, and many of the details were revealed today in the Cox report. Now, the Cox report was a bipartisan congressional investigation, and it raised many pertinent questions.

The Communist Chinese now have in their possession our top nuclear secrets. They have cut in half, certainly more than half, the years of research that it took the United States to construct such weapons. They stole this information. They saved many, many years and they saved millions, if not billions, of dollars.

And while this has gone on under a lot of different administrations and over a long period of time, it is obviously clear that the Clinton administration, the National Security Adviser Sandy Berger, knew about this at least in April of 1996. He briefed the President of the United States in July of 1997, again in November of 1998, and since January of 1999, the White House has been sitting on the completed Cox report.

And yet only in March of this year did they take steps to fire one potential suspected spy, Wen Ho Lee. Only then. And, actually, he is not arrested at this point. He is still only on administrative leave, I think. I do not know exactly what the term is.

But the two questions here are: How big is this thing; how much information do they have on our nuclear weapons in China? And why did the administration react the way it did?

I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, our colleague from Florida amply pointed out just one threat to our national security. Mr. Speaker, I would go further in the realm of Chinese espionage to say to this House and to the American people that we face a clear and present danger.

Mr. Speaker, the report released today, available on the Internet, and I am sure many responsible publications across the United States will carry it in detail tomorrow, outlines a traumatic, devastating loss to this Nation in terms of national security, and that is why I describe it as a clear and present danger.

My colleague from Georgia pointed out the fact that this bipartisan report was drafted and really completed in

January of this year, and only now, some 5, almost 6 months later, has this report at long last been released to the American people.

It has been a strength of our society that once we as a people recognize a threat, we deal with that threat in a responsible manner. And yet, Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to do so at this juncture in our history because of what has been called, in common parlance, "spin"; what some used to call in the past "smoke and mirrors." And while my colleague pointed out that espionage is nothing new, that different countries observe and conduct surveillance on one another, the fact is that the disturbing information is something that this House and this Nation must deal with and should deal with immediately.

□ 2340

A point that should be addressed is the inevitable spin echoes from sympathetic pundits and indeed from the spin machine at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue that, oh, this has happened before and previous Presidents are to blame.

Let me offer this simple analogy: Mr. Speaker, suppose you contemplate a vacation and you take reasonable precautions in your house. You will lock your doors. You lock your windows. If you have an alarm device, you activate it. And yet thieves are aware that you have left your home. They disable the alarm system. They gain entrance to your home. And they begin to take your property. Your belongings.

Now, that is one thing. But contrast it. If someone is sitting at home in the easy chair and these same thieves pull up and the person in the home says, "Well, come on in. And you might want to look in this area. And by the way, let me offer to show you where my wife keeps her jewelry. And here are our stocks and bonds. And let me help you take these and load up your van. And listen, we will just keep this between us because it would be very embarrassing to me if I allowed this information to get out, if I chose to stop this. So I will take minimum action to stop what has gone on." That analogy, however imperfect, essentially sums up what has transpired.

It is important to note, as my colleague from Georgia capably points out, that, sadly, our national security advisor, with the responsibility that that title in fact describes, has aided our national insecurity, compounding that, the curious actions of the Justice Department and our current attorney general.

My colleague from Georgia mentioned Wen Ho Lee, the suspected spy at one of our national labs, still not arrested. And indeed the Justice Department asked for wiretap authority when there was a preponderance of evidence and more than reasonable suspicion that it should be checked.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, actually it was the

FBI that asked the Justice Department.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for correcting the record. I misspoke. The FBI asked the Justice Department for the ability to wiretap this individual because of the threat to our national security. And in all the wiretaps issued following our constitutional procedures, this particular wiretap was denied. This special surveillance was denied.

Couple that with the curious case of a Chinese arms merchant suddenly gaining clearance for the import into this country of 100,000 weapons to be used on the streets of our inner cities where again the agency in charge looked the other way. Couple that with the disturbing reality of the fact that the communist Chinese through their business operations controlled by their so-called People's Liberation Army actually contributed to the Clinton-Gore effort in 1996 and, sadly, to the Democratic National Committee in that same year, and we have a compelling devastating case that should cause concern for every American.

Before I yield back to my friend from Georgia, just so we can clear this up, this is not a matter of partisanship. It is a question of patriotism. Because we confront a clear and present danger, we must avoid the temptation of engaging in personalities and instead deal with policies and change those policies.

But regrettably, to this date, this administration has been more interested in spin and preening and posturing and offering the clever retort or the by now familiar rejoinder that "everyone does it."

Mr. Speaker, I am here to tell my colleagues again that not everyone does it, but sadly all too many people within this administration have not fulfilled their responsibilities to the citizens of this country to maintain vigilance and to take actions against those who would steal our secrets.

Mr. Speaker, it is worth noting that the findings are chilling. In the overview, just to repeat from the Cox summary, China has stolen design information on the United States' most advanced thermonuclear weapons. The Select Committee on Intelligence, the bipartisan committee, judges that China's next generation of thermonuclear weapons currently under development will exploit elements of stolen U.S. design information and China's penetration of our national weapons laboratories spans at least the past several decades and almost certainly continues today.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if I can reclaim my time, I want to stop at that point for a minute. Because what is interesting is we hear these incessant defenders of this administration, regardless of what the administration does, they are automatically with them but forget the facts. They keep saying, well, it still does not matter because China has x number of nuclear warheads and America has x-number-plus nuclear warheads.